



## **US 14/WIS 11 corridor study**

Between US 51 and I-43  
Rock and Walworth counties  
Project ID 1706-05-00

# **Technical Committee Meeting #1 meeting notes**

**9:00 a.m.**

Tuesday, January 20, 2004 – Town of Bradford Town Hall

### **Welcome and introductions**

Darin Blang, TN & Associates project manager, welcomed the group.

### **Project description**

Mr. Blang gave an overview of the project.

Peter Nauth, DATCP, mentioned prime agricultural land is located both north and south of corridor. Between Janesville and Emerald Grove is better than east of Emerald Grove. East of there, the prime ag land is predominantly north of corridor.

Fay Amerson, Walworth County, has land use plan. Walworth County has classified soils that she will make available to the Project Team.

**Action item** -- Mr. Blang agreed to meet with Ms. Amerson and Mr. Nauth to make sure the soils data is mapped to everyone's satisfaction.

Mr. Blang also went over project schedule and the average daily traffic (ADT) map.

Peter Nauth asked about how the ADT numbers were projected? Mr. Blang responded that the 2003 ADT represents actual numbers and that DOT District 1 projected the 2013 and 2033 numbers. 2033 is the design year, which is the year the designers will use when designing the highway improvements.

Brad Cantrell, Janesville Planning Director, thought the counts seemed low between US 51 and G and asked if John Bieberitz would look at those figures again and verify those data.

**Action item** – Mr. Blang said he would ask Mr. Bieberitz to look at those data again.

Mr. Blang also mentioned regional importance of corridor. It is identified in Corridors 2020 plan as a "collector." He said that DOT is looking at the corridor also because ADT is approaching 8,700 vehicles and that is the minimum threshold for considering roadway expansion to four-lanes.

Johnny Gerbitz, FHWA, asked if the 14/11 corridor is on the NHS maps. No one knew.

**Action item** – Mr. Blang will check to see if it is on the NHS maps.

Question: Phil Blazkowski, Rock County regarding the status of recommendation to expand 14/11 on west side of Janesville. He wants to expand the study and urged DOT to consider this request again. Mr. Cantrell also mentioned this issue and said Janesville has been talking to state for 10 years about this issue. Mr. Gerbitz also agreed that US 51 is a strange place to stop the study and that a more logical terminus would be I-90. District 2 also mentioned they think it's an odd terminus. Marshall Quade, DOT District 1, mentioned he would bring it up again with DOT.

Mr. Blang mentioned Level of Service numbers. In 2033, everything east of 140 is LOS D. Everything west of 140 intersection is a LOS E for 2033 (design year).

### **Consulting and agency team and role of committees**

Mike Slavney, Vandewalle & Associates, gave an overview of the organizational chart and briefed the group on the expectations of technical committee. There are seven major expectations of the Technical Committee:

- Improve communications between the Study Team and the organizations represented on the Technical Committee.
- Suggest and review data from Study Team and take it back to your respective organizations and agencies.
- Provide advice about how to communicate the technical information to the public and the Advisory Committee/elected officials along the corridor.
- Develop and refine alternative solutions with the Project Team.
- Help develop and refine the Purpose and Need statement.
- Help review project documentation.
- Interact with and communicate with the Advisory Committee throughout the study.

### **What we've heard so far**

Makela Mangrich, Vandewalle & Associates, gave a brief summary of comments from the public information meetings. These include the following:

- Many participants had concerns about increased congestion, problem intersections, excessive speeds and limited passing areas in general. Some felt that driver behavior, alcohol or out-of-state drivers were the main reasons for problems along the corridor, and that better enforcement would improve safety and overall traffic operations substantially. Others felt that the roadway itself posed serious challenges to even astute and conscientious drivers and that improvements were essential to improving safety for all drivers on the road.
- Intersections mentioned most often as problematic include the US 14/WIS 11 intersection with 140, 89, County M/C and County G, although some people mentioned crossing US 14/WIS 11 from any of the side roads was particularly challenging. In addition, many people felt that farm machinery did not have adequate

room to operate and that it was difficult for automobiles to pass them safely in certain areas.

- Concerns about loss of farmland dominated discussions not directly tied to the roadway itself. Even people who commented about problems with the roadway, mentioned that high quality farmland along the corridor should be considered a more valuable and irreplaceable resource to the community and state than more roadway improvements.
- Specific comments from one-on-one conversations with people and written comments collected from these meetings have been compiled and are available on the project Web site at <http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/projects/d1/wis11study/index.htm>.

### **Input on project purpose and need statement**

Mr. Blang previewed a draft of some “taking points” for the purpose and need statement, to be developed in the coming months.

Ms. Amerson mentioned that land use should be a consideration. Mr. Slavney gave overview of land use analysis and how it will fit into the project.

There was also discussion about the importance of protecting access and DOT investment. DOT has been preserving access on highway for past 30 years. This should be added to the draft purpose and need statement.

### **Other items discussed**

Maureen Millmann, WisDNR, mentioned that there were state and federally-listed T & E species in Turtle Creek, including a possible federally-listed snake species. DNR owns land up to US 14, which federal funds were used to acquire. DOT will question 2033 ADT volumes south of Turtle Creek, which is currently listed as 11,900 ADT. They will say that is too high. She will check to see how T&E information should be presented. They may be able to give us some data.

Rock County – Natural Area Study. Rob Ballard has a map in his office showing Natural Areas. Worked with DNR to develop this map. The map identifies 5-10 new state natural areas in Rock County and ranked 185 areas for natural area conservation.

**Action item** – Project Team will get detailed information from DNR Natural Area folks to identify these locations.

Mr. Gerbitz will invoke 404 process with the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) and begin to coordinate with agencies to notify them of our intent to file an EIS for this project. He will get started on putting agencies together. They will need 4-6 weeks for agency review. He doesn't want to play catch-up with purpose and need statement, so it will be important to get the agencies reviewing this as soon as possible. Mr. Blang wants to have the purpose and need statement in next month.

**Action item** -- Notice of Intent to prepare an environmental study (NOI). Project Team will need to work on this.

There was a question about the Rock County Transportation Plan model and if it was complete yet. No. DOT should revisit some assumptions. Mr. Quade thinks the numbers should be revisited, as does Mr. Cantrell.

**Meeting adjourned at 11 a.m.**

Next Meeting to be determined.

Please review calendars and contact Makela Mangrich, (608)255-3988, or [mmangrich@vandewalle.com](mailto:mmangrich@vandewalle.com), with a time that works for you.